

ADVISORY BOARD ON TEACHER EDUCATION AND LICENSURE

Minutes

Meeting Date and Location: April 15, 2002
Sheraton Richmond West Hotel

ABTEL Members Present:

Mychele Brickner	Mark Glaser	Dale Sander
Sharon Condrey	Cheryl Lightfoot	Margaret Shibley-Gray
Judy Davis-Dorsey	Kimberly Loy	Donna Smith
Ronald Diss	Jane Massey-Wilson	J. David Smith
Brenda Duda	Mary McCauley	Susan Walton
Jill Fox	Nancy Miller	

ABTEL Members Absent: Holly Hawthorne
Ken Fleming

Board of Education Liaison: Susan T. Noble

Ex-Officio Members: Carole Ballard
Nancy Cooley

Department of Education Staff:	Thomas A. Elliott	JoAnne Y. Carver
	Pat Burgess	Paul F. Joseph
	Patty Pitts	

Guest: James Hoover, Planning Principal
Matoaca High School

FULL ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

Dr. Jane Massey-Wilson, Chair of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) presided. The meeting was called to order at approximately 9 a.m. with a welcome to the advisory board members and guest and was opened with a moment of silence.

INTRODUCTION OF GUEST

Dr. Massey-Wilson introduced Mr. James Hoover, Planning Principal for Matoaca High School.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Jane Massey-Wilson asked if there were any recommended changes to the agenda. Since none were suggested, Brenda Duda made a motion to approve the agenda; Mary McCauley seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

David Smith made a motion to approve minutes of the March 18, 2002, ABTEL meeting. The motion was seconded by Donna Smith and carried unanimously.

PRESENTATION BY JAMES HOOVER

Dr. Elliott introduced Mr. James Hoover who is the planning principal at the new Matoaca High School. Matoaca High School, the most technologically advanced school in Chesterfield County, will house the Center for Learning and Teaching Through Technology. This specialty center is divided into two strands, both of which have firm foundations in technology use. The first strand, Learning Through Technology, opens in the fall of 2002. The second strand, Teaching Through Technology, is scheduled to open in the fall of 2003. Dr. Elliott added that Mr. Hoover's presentation was timely as it aligns with previous ABTEL discussions regarding the possibility of having a pilot group of high school graduates take the Praxis I.

The Center for Teaching Through Technology assists in producing future teachers by encouraging and preparing students for the teaching profession. Students will explore instructional strategies and apply those best practices to actual classroom settings. The objectives of the program include:

- to home-grow teachers for Chesterfield County Public Schools;
- to meet the growing demand for qualified teachers;
- to promote a positive image of the teaching profession;
- to increase awareness of the broad career opportunities and expanded job-related tasks of education;
- to prepare students for responsible citizenship through community service;
- to prepare students to utilize the latest technology as a medium of instructional delivery as well as learning;
- to facilitate access to institutions of higher learning among students who might not otherwise have such opportunities.

Mr. Hoover emphasized that his plan was not to create "a center within a center." Rather, the goal is to ensure that all students would participate in the center's activities. For that reason each student and teacher at Matoaca High School will be issued a laptop computer. All required course work will have technology integrated into the curriculum.

Each year fifty students will be selected from middle school candidates for participation in the program. When fully implemented, 250 students will be enrolled in the program during a school year. The selection criteria include interviews with students and portfolio reviews.

Mr. Hoover expressed his excitement with the candidates who had been selected to participate in the program and for the progress they were making as they approach this fall's school opening. Dr. Massey-Wilson congratulated Mr. Hoover on his efforts in establishing this center and thanked him for his presentation.

ANNUAL REPORT ON APPROVED TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS IN VIRGINIA

Dr. JoAnne Y. Carver provided ABTEL members an overview of the components of the Annual Report on Approved Teacher Preparation Programs in Virginia. Beginning in May 2002, the Division of Teacher Education and Licensure will provide an Annual Report on Approved Teacher Preparation Programs in Virginia to the Board of Education. This report will consist of information that is consolidated from the following sources:

- The Regulations Governing Approved Programs for Virginia Institutions of Higher Education, effective July 1, 2001, require colleges and universities in Virginia to submit an annual data report to the Department of Education;
- Title II of the Higher Education Act requires institutions to submit an annual report to state departments of education on April 7 of each year that provide pass rates on the state's assessments for teachers (Praxis), information about student teaching, and supplemental data that distinguishes each program;
- Institutions accredited by NCATE (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education) must submit joint NCATE/AACTE (American Association of the Colleges of Teacher Education) annual reports.

The information contained in these reports will be consolidated to form the basis of Part I of the annual report on programs for the preparation of school personnel. In addition, the report will contain a section on Virginia At-A-Glance that provides information including a listing of the 37 colleges/universities with approved programs; total program enrollment; total number of full-time faculty; total number of program completers; and the total number of graduates. This section also includes supplemental information on each institution. Key elements of the report include an executive summary section and key findings and conclusions.

Part II of the annual report will be devoted to colleges and universities that have undergone an on-site review as part of the five-year accreditation and program approval procedures. Part II will summarize the report of findings for each review and recommended actions resulting from the reviews.

Mark Glaser asked how many initially licensed teachers were employed. Dr. Elliott advised him that this information is not part of the Title II report but is found in our Supply and Demand report that can be accessed on the Department of Education's Web site. Mr. Glaser also inquired about the number of adjunct professors with Ph.Ds. Dr. Elliott responded that this information will not be a part of this report.

PRESENTATION BY DR. ELLIOTT ON THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT--NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT, OF 2001

Dr. Elliott made a presentation on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), specifically addressing the following sections of the Act:

- Qualifications of Teachers
Title I, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 1119
- Qualifications of Paraprofessionals
Title I, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 1119
- Teacher Qualification Disclosure
Title I, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 1111
- Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Funds
Title II, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 2101
- Transition to Teaching
Title II, Part C, Subpart 1, Chapter B, Section 2311
- Troops to Teachers
Title II, Part C, Subpart 1, Chapter A, Section 2301

The act will have significant implications for classroom teachers and licensure. Some mandates of the act become effective as soon as the 2002-03 school year. For example, new teachers hired after the start of 2002-03 in programs supported by Title I, Part A, must be "highly qualified." All teachers must be "highly qualified" by the end of the 2005-06 school year. Dr. Elliott suggested that a two-tiered approach to defining "qualified" and "highly qualified" teachers may be appropriate. The Board of Education will ultimately approve the definition of "highly qualified" teachers; however, Dr. Elliott stated that the following definitions have been discussed by Department staff:

"Qualified" teachers are those individuals holding provisional or special education conditional licenses issued by the Board of Education for a period not to exceed three years, and who have not had regular licensure requirements waived.

“Highly qualified” teachers are those individuals who have obtained a five-year renewable license with endorsement(s) in the assigned area(s) issued by the Board of Education.

[Please note that these definitions have not been approved for Virginia by the Board of Education. Each state must submit its definition in accordance with the requirements of ESEA.]

Another mandate of the act requires that new paraprofessionals must be “highly qualified;” existing paraprofessionals must be “highly qualified” no later than four years after the date (2005-06) of the enactment. “Highly qualified” paraprofessionals are defined in the act as individuals who:

- have at least two years of post-secondary study;
- have obtained an associates degree or higher degree;
- have met a rigorous standard of quality and can demonstrate through a formal academic assessment knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing and mathematics.

Dr. Elliott reported that the Educational Testing Service (ETS) is interested in designing a test for paraprofessionals. Dr. Elliott will discuss this matter with ETS officials later this week. Additionally, he advised members that issues such as competencies and possible licensure requirements would be matters for ABTEL’s review.

Dr. Elliott encouraged participation in four academies that were announced in Superintendent’s Informational Memorandum No. 44 dated March 29, 2002. These academies will address the new requirements of the act. Dr. Elliott also announced that the date for the Region V and VIII academy had been changed to May 16 and 17. As the memorandum states, the new law imposes significant challenges that include consequences. One consequence discussed was the potential of allowing parents to remove children from schools not meeting the requirements and allow them to transfer to other schools. Many other policy issues are involved and need to be considered.

REPORTS FROM THE TEACHER EDUCATION COMMITTEE AND LICENSURE COMMITTEE

Teacher Education Committee

Agenda Item A:

Final Review of a Pilot Project to Offer Praxis I for High School Graduates Interested in Pursuing a Teaching Career During the Summer of 2003.

Nancy Miller reported on the discussion of the initiative to offer the Praxis I to high school graduates interested in pursuing a teaching career. **On behalf of the committee, Ms. Miller made a motion to support a pilot project in the summer of 2003 to offer**

the Praxis I to recent high school graduates interested in pursuing a teaching career. Further, it was recommended that the pilot program embrace others from graduating high school classes that were not enrolled in future educator clubs. The members of ABTEL unanimously approved this motion.

Agenda Item B:

Final Review of the Annual Report on Approved Teacher Preparation Programs in Virginia.

Nancy Miller made a motion, on behalf of the teacher education committee, that the format for Annual Report on Approved Teacher Preparation Programs in Virginia be approved. The motion was unanimously approved by the board.

Agenda Item C:

Final Review of Suggested Strategies to Enhance the Proficiency of Pre-Service and In-Service Teachers in Systematic Explicit Phonics Instruction.

Nancy Miller noted that during the committee discussion a motion was made that the committee recommend a statewide assessment in reading as a third means of improving instruction in systematic explicit phonics. This motion was defeated in committee by a vote of 6-2.

On behalf of the Teacher Education Committee, Ms. Miller moved that the following three strategies be recommended to enhance the proficiency of elementary and special education pre-service and in-service teachers in systematic explicit phonics instruction:

I. Strengthening pre-service preparation of elementary and special education teachers

Recommendation: *Prepare pre-service teachers to demonstrate proficiency in systematic explicit phonics including how to teach the 44 sounds and 26 letters of the English language and how to instruct students in 1) phonemic awareness in rhyming, blending, segmentation; 2) deletion and substitution of phonemes; and 3) structural analysis in phonics. In addition, pre-service preparation should enable prospective teachers to assess children in grades k-3 in the areas of phonemic awareness and phonics, appropriate use of decodable texts, and the application of phonemic awareness and phonics instruction to read for meaning.*

II. Developing strategies for assessing proficiency in systematic explicit phonics instruction

Recommendation: *Design assessments that address fundamental knowledge and skills in systematic explicit phonics instruction and reading for meaning.*

- The development of assessments in Virginia to measure pre-service and in-service proficiency of teachers may include a variety of strategies such as a statewide test; simulated activities; videos; portfolios; college course work; or other initiatives.

- The implementation of these assessment strategies should provide the option for teachers to meet identified competencies through demonstrated knowledge and the ability to assist students in systematic explicit phonics instruction.

III. Enhancing professional development strategies for in-service educators and institutional officials that prepare beginning teachers in systematic explicit phonics instruction

Recommendation: *Provide professional development opportunities in systematic explicit phonics instruction for administrators, language arts lead teachers, reading specialists, curriculum specialists, special education teachers, teachers of English as a Second Language, and others responsible for teaching reading.*

During the full board review of the three strategies David Smith recommended a change in wording to ensure clarity so that no one could construe that Virginia was opting for statewide assessments. For that reason in Paragraph II, “The development of Virginia assessments...” was recommended to read, “The development of assessments in Virginia...” His recommendation was approved.

Mychele Brickner voiced her concern as she was under the impression that ABTEL’s previous studies of the Educational Testing Services’ reading test and the RICA reading assessment were for the purpose of selecting a statewide reading test. She expressed disappointment that the ABTEL was not recommending a reading test for its teachers. Dr. Elliott responded that the ABTEL had not voted to recommend a statewide assessment, but had conducted reviews of the tests as part of the process of gathering information to make a recommendation. David Smith added that it is important to recognize the importance of other measures used to improve reading instruction and that a statewide assessment has not been eliminated but should be considered with a variety of other assessments. Dr. Elliott concluded that the three strategies (1) identified the competencies required; (2) provide for a variety of strategies for assessing the proficiencies; and (3) benefited all educators noted in the strategies from the varied professional development activities.

The motion made by Nancy Miller on behalf of the committee was approved with the modification recommended by David Smith. The vote was 15 in favor of the motion, 0 against the motion, and one abstention (Mark Glaser).

Licensure Committee

Agenda Item A:

Final Review of Recommended Guidelines for Implementing Option 4-Division Superintendent License.

On behalf of the licensure committee, Susan Walton made a motion for the advisory committee to approve the attached Guidelines for Implementing Option 4-Division

Superintendent License for Board of Education review. Mark Glaser inquired whether the Licensure Committee members voted on the motion. Susan Walton responded that the Licensure Committee passed the motion unanimously. **The advisory board voted unanimously to approve the motion.**

Agenda Item B:

Final Review of a Plan to Conduct Match, validation, and Standard-setting Studies of Praxis II Tests, Education of Exceptional Student: Core Content Knowledge (0353) and Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0452).

Susan Walton, on behalf of the licensure committee, made a motion that the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure approve the plan to conduct match, validation, and standard-setting studies of the Praxis II tests, Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353) and the Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542). She added that only one of the two tests, if determined to match Virginia requirements, would be recommended for initial licensure for special educators. The motion was passed unanimously.

Agenda Item C:

Final Review of a Plan to Conduct Match, Validation, and Standard –Setting Studies of the Praxis II Learning Disabilities (0382) Assessment and Praxis II Assessments in Emotional Disturbance and Mental Retardation when Available.

Susan Walton explained that the match, validation, and standard-setting studies conducted for the 0382-Education of Exceptional Students: Learning Disabilities and for the tests in mental retardation and emotional disturbances (when available) will be to determine the appropriateness of using an established score on each assessment for individuals who hold an endorsement in special education (emotional disturbances and mental retardation) to add an additional endorsement in one of the three areas. These tests are not being considered for initial licensure, only to add an endorsement if an individual already holds a Virginia license with endorsements in emotional disturbances, learning disabilities, or mental retardation. Individuals holding endorsements in Virginia's five other exceptionalities (early childhood special education, hearing impairment, visual impairment, severe disabilities and speech language pathology) could not use these tests to add an endorsement.

Susan Walton, on behalf of the licensure committee, made a motion that the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure approve the plan to conduct match, validation and standard-setting of the Praxis II learning disabilities (0382) assessment and Praxis II assessments in emotional disturbances and mental retardation when available. The motion was passed unanimously.

Agenda Item D:

Final Review of a Plan to Investigate the Feasibility of Using the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) as an Alternative to Praxis I.

On behalf of the licensure committee, Susan Walton made a motion that the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure approve a plan for conducting a feasibility study of the comparable score required on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) as an alternative to the Praxis I test requirement for beginning teachers. This motion was passed unanimously.

LIAISON REPORTS

Virginia Community College System

Carole Ballard, liaison to the advisory board, reported that the community college system successfully completed three regional conferences addressing strategies to assist students in the teacher preparation process. She also reported that Old Dominion University has accepted the community college course, Education 200, as meeting its ECI 301 professional studies foundations of education requirement.

The State Council of Higher Education (SCHEV)

Dr. Nancy Cooley provided information on two resource documents that may be of interest to the advisory board members:

“Recruiting Teachers for Hard to Staff Schools”
(Accessible from the Web site www.teachingquality.org.)

“Teaching Quality in the Southeast: Meeting the Challenge.”

The Virginia Department of Education

Dr. Elliott referred the advisory board members to the letter in their materials from Roseann Runte, President, Old Dominion University, regarding the advisory board meeting held at the institution last month. Dr. Massey-Wilson thanked Dr. Elliott for preparing the thank you note to the president and dean of ODU on behalf of the advisory board.

Dr. Elliott recommended that as many members as possible participate in the four regional “No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) “academies. Dates of the academies are provided in the superintendent’s memorandum. The date change for Regions V and VIII was referred to previously in the minutes. Dr. Elliott will present at the academies in Williamsburg and Richmond. Patty Pitts will participate in the academy at Charlottesville, and Dr. JoAnne Carver will present in Roanoke.

Dr. Elliott reported that the 2002 General Assembly approved a resolution to create a committee to revise the School Leadership Program.

Dr. Elliott encouraged advisory board members to attend the Teacher Education Forum, April 22 and 23, 2002, at the Hilton Garden Inn, Richmond, Virginia.

Initiatives for the 2002-03 School Year

The advisory board members discussed possible initiatives for the 2002-03 year. The initiatives discussed were as follows:

A discussion followed to list possible initiatives that the board could pursue next year. The following possibilities were noted:

- Conduct Match, validation and standard-setting studies of Praxis II tests, Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge (0353) and the Education of Exceptional Students: Mild to Moderate Disabilities (0542);
- Conduct match, validation, and standard setting studies for the Praxis II assessments in learning disabilities (LD), mental retardation (MR), and emotional disturbance (ED). These assessments will be reviewed only for the purposes of adding endorsements for individuals who already hold endorsements in LD, MR, and ED;
- Review the possibility of establishing a mild-moderate/moderate-severe endorsement in special education;
- Review a plan to discontinue the visiting teacher endorsement;
- Develop competencies for paraprofessionals;
- Continue work to conduct a Praxis I pilot for high school graduates;
- Follow-up on strategies and blueprint on systematic explicit phonics instruction;
- Address issues emerging from ESEA; and
- Participate in college approved program reviews.

The licensure committee members inquired whether the advisory board would need to address child abuse training as required for license renewal. Dr. Elliott indicated that the advisory board would monitor this action but that responsibility had been moved to Pupil Personnel Services.

No additional initiatives or issues were identified.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.